



Approved
11 JAN 10
CFN

MINUTES ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

December 14, 2009
7:30 P.M.
City Hall, Council Chambers
Fredericksburg, Virginia

<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u>	<u>CITY STAFF</u>
Owen Lindauer, Chair Robin Wood, Vice Chair Jamie Scully Marilynn Mendell Lisa Peverill Barry Waldman Donna Chasen		Erik Nelson, Senior Planner Sheree Waddy, Recording Secretary

Mr. Lindauer called the Architectural Review Board to order at 7:30 p.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Lindauer determined that a quorum was present. Mr. Nelson stated that public notice requirements had been met.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Lindauer asked if there were additional items for the agenda.

Mr. Lindauer asked to add the following item to Other Business: Item 6 – Salutations.

Ms. Wood made a motion to accept the agenda as amended. Ms. Chasen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Mr. Lindauer asked if there were any changes to the November 9, 2009 meeting minutes.

Ms. Mendell made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. Ms. Wood seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Lindauer asked if any board member had a conflict of interest or had participated in ex parte communications on any of the agenda items. No one said that they had.

Ms. Peverill said she would recuse herself from Item 1 (109 Caroline Street) because she had assisted in the preparation of the application.

APPLICATIONS – REGULAR AGENDA

1. 109 Caroline Street (John N. Pearce) – Exterior alterations

The applicant was present. Mr. Pearce said his goal was to ensure that installing the railings was a completely reversible process.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, asked if the railings would be attached to the stucco.

Mr. Waldman thanked the applicant for submitting a complete application. He added that the drawings showed that the railings would be attached to the concrete pad.

Mr. Waldman said he found the exterior alterations to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Chasen seconded. The motion carried unanimously, with Ms. Peverill abstaining.

2. 1213 Prince Edward Street (Mr. and Mrs. David Morgan) – Exterior alterations

The applicants were present.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Scully asked for clarification of the statement made in the staff memo, “will not create a false historic impression.”

Mr. Nelson explained that there will be a subtle differentiation between the old and the new through the materials (new windows and brick foundation).

Mr. Scully noted that the existing structure has a brick foundation.

Mr. Nelson said the new bricks will be slightly different, as has occurred on other portions of the foundation.

Mr. Lindauer asked if there would be any foundation or utility trench digging.

Mr. Morgan said there would be some excavating under the existing addition, but it would not be very extensive.

Mr. Lindauer explained to the applicants that they live in an archaeologically sensitive area and any excavation could uncover archaeological resources. He suggested that the applicants contact staff if they uncovered any objects.

Mr. Waldman said the design and materials were very attractive and consistent. His only concern was that everything appeared to match and there was very little differentiation between old and new. He noted it was difficult to determine the age of the additions in the back. He said he would prefer to see better definition of the new addition.

Ms. Peverill said she found the exterior alterations to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Scully seconded.

Mr. Lindauer asked to amend the motion to include that the applicants contact staff if, while digging, they uncover any archaeological objects.

Mr. Morgan asked if the Board would prefer if he changed the windows.

Ms. Peverill asked Mr. Morgan to clarify the changes he proposed to do.

Mr. Morgan said he would add more windows.

Ms. Peverill said more windows or a different type of siding would provide more differentiation than the current proposal.

Mr. Scully suggested that the proposed windows for the new addition should be clearly different than those of the rest of the house.

Mr. Waldman said that frequently on additions there will be a corner board or a division board to delineate the line between old and new. He said he was not as concerned about the windows, and that a simple square instead of a rosette trim would help to identify it as an early twenty-first century addition.

Mr. Waldman asked to make an amendment that the windows be wood, vinyl clad windows, or the same manufacture and material as the existing windows.

Mr. Lindauer asked Mr. Morgan if wanted the Board to decide on the motion or change his proposal.

Mr. Nelson stated that the applicant could amend his proposal any time prior to construction.

Mr. Lindauer explained to the applicants that this was their property and that they could return to amend their application, but that the Board would take action so they could proceed with the permitting process.

Ms. Peverill and Mr. Scully accepted the amendments.

The motion carried unanimously.

3. 1509 Caroline Street (Karen and David Primmer) – Exterior alterations

The applicants were present.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, made comments unrelated to the application.

Mr. Waldman said that the applicant's drawings were very impressive. He added that the drawings demonstrated how little of this project will be viewed from the public right-of-way. Mr. Waldman said he appreciated the fact that the slate roof would be continued, and that the asphalt used in the rear would help to delineate new construction. He said his only concern was that the shutters would not be operable or appear to be operable.

Mr. Lindauer asked if there would be any foundation or utility trench digging.

Mr. Primmer said that a utility trench would be dug under the sun porch and that he had listened to and would take heed of Mr. Lindauer's previous comments concerning archaeological objects.

Mr. Waldman said he found the exterior alterations to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the shutters be operable or appear to be operable and that proper care be taken with any archaeological finds. Ms. Wood seconded.

Mr. Waldman added that he found the entryway and lights very attractive.

The motion carried unanimously.

4. 623 Caroline Street (Howard D. Pickett III) - Fence

The applicant was present.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, commented that the fence was really nice but he had not previously noticed that the finished side of the fence was on the inside.

Ms. Mendell said she did not like the fact that the fence was already installed without ARB review. She asked staff to clarify how the fence was installed without ARB review with the finished side facing in.

Mr. Nelson said he would let the applicant explain himself.

Mr. Pickett said he was not aware that the fence required ARB review or that that unfinished side had to face in. He said the Economic Development Authority (EDA) did not stipulate how the fence had to be installed.

Ms. Mendell said that the contractor should have known the smooth side traditionally faced out and advised Mr. Pickett.

Mr. Pickett said that the exterior of the building was not in good shape when he leased the property and his only concern was to get it cleaned up and get his business started. He said this was his first downtown project and he did not know about these fence issues.

Mr. Lindauer asked Mr. Nelson if there had been any previous public comment on this application.

Mr. Nelson said there had not been.

Mr. Waldman said the fence was attractive, although it was inside out. He noted that the Board sent a guideline flyer out to all Historic District business and property owners prior to Mr. Pickett leasing the property—he suggested the Board consider sending the flyer to local contractors as well. He said he was undecided as to whether or not the applicant should be required to face the outside of the fence.

Mr. Lindauer commented that he did not find the fence objectionable and he could understand how events evolved the way they did.

Mr. Scully asked for clarification on whether both sides of the fence would be painted.

Mr. Pickett said they would be.

Mr. Scully said he found the installed fence to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Wood seconded.

Mr. Waldman said he that if he voted against the motion, it would be a vote against the contractor rather than the owner.

Mr. Lindauer asked Mr. Waldman if he believed the incorrect facing of the fence was a historic compatibility issue.

Mr. Waldman said yes. He said other fences constructed in the district are constructed with the finished side out, which makes them compatible with the appearance on a historic building. The fence itself is a wood painted fence, which is appropriate, but it would be very unusual for this style of fence to have its finished side face the building.

Ms. Mendell asked for clarification of what the City Ordinance required for fences.

Mr. Nelson said the City Ordinance did not specify that a fence have its finished side face out. He said it was more a tradition.

Mr. Mendell said she did not want to set a precedent by approving this fence.

Mr. Waldman said that using Section 78-759 as a reference made it difficult for him to justify his objection to the fence.

Ms. Peverill said that with both sides of the fence painted, the side of the fence considered to be finished was subjective.

Ms. Mendell argued that the side with the bracing was always considered the unfinished side.

Ms. Peverill said in her opinion that was still subjective.

Mr. Pickett said the EDA did not inform him about any fence requirements.

Mr. Lindauer said that historic compatibility was something that could be determined by workmanship. He said the fence was appropriate as far as material and height and he was not concerned about the finished side facing in.

Mr. Waldman called for the vote on the motion. The motion carried 6-1, with Ms. Mendell opposed.

5. VRE Parking Lot to Caroline Street (City of Fredericksburg) - Stairs

The applicant was represented by Erik Nelson.

James Lawrence, 802 Caroline Street, said he hoped that VRE hired a good contractor to do the work.

Mr. Waldman said he found the stairs to be architecturally compatible with the historic aspects of the Historic District and made a motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Chasen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Business

1. 515 Princess Anne Street (Shiloh Baptist Church, New Site) – Mr. Nelson said the applicants had not submitted any additional information the Board had requested.
2. Transmittal of draft Preservation Plan and staff notes – Mr. Nelson said the task force did not make an actual presentation at the Planning Commission work session, but said they would answer questions instead. The task force said the draft may be amended in response to staff comments.
3. Transmittal of public comments from Preservation Plan public meeting – Mr. Nelson transmitted the public comments. Mr. Scully asked if the Board would have the opportunity to provide comments on the draft plan to the Planning Commission. Mr. Nelson said yes. Mr. Waldman suggested that the Board wait to comment until the Planning Commission asks. Mr. Waldman made a motion to table Board comments until they were requested. Ms. Chasen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
4. Transmittal of NAPC newsletter – Mr. Nelson provided copies of the newsletter.
5. Transmittal of draft Annual Report – Mr. Lindauer complimented Mr. Nelson for his work on the draft Annual Report. Mr. Waldman suggested tabling approval of the report until the

January meeting. Ms. Chasen made a motion to table consideration of the report. Mr. Waldman seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Salutations – Mr. Lindauer thanked Mr. Waldman for all his work on the ARB and said it had been honor and pleasure and he would truly be missed. Mr. Lindauer added that this would be the last meeting he would chair and wished the next chair all the best.

The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Owen Lindauer, Chair